



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandra, Vignus 22313-1450 www.uspto.gcv

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2003

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/866,205	05/25/2001	Shea Chen	004578.1123	4344
75	590 07/07/2003			
Jerry W. Mills, Esq.			EXAMINER	
Baker Botts L.L Suite 600			LUEBKE, RENEE S	
2001 Ross Avenue Dallas, TX 75201-2980			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2833	<u>. </u>

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/866,205	CHEN & PILLANS & EHMKE & YAO			
	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Renee S. Luebke	2833			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 12 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appear Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applic) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a chaptach a chaptach and chaptach application in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	the final rejection.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly			
For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed: 10,20 and 25-36.					
Claim(s) objected to: 37 and 38					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,4,6-9,11,14-16,18,19 and 21</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	proved by the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)				
10. ✓ Other: See Continuation Sheet					
		Renee S. Luebke Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2833			

Continuation of 5. (does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:) applicant's arguments are not convincing. As pointed out in the previous rejection, each outer portion of the Randall membrane has an upper area that is "free of physical coupling to the base" as claimed; the lower area of the outer portion is coupled to the base.

Contrary to Applicant's assertion, the rejection is not based solely on Randall. As previously stated, the rejection is based on Applicant's indicated "existing" type of switch as discussed in the application. The comparison in the previous Office action to Goldsmith and the prior art shown by Randall is solely to show that applicant's "existing" device IS old and IS "prior art" as challenged (but not supported) by Applicant. In other words, the basis of the rejection did not change from the first Office action to the second Office action, except to include explanation based on the amendments to the claims.

Continuation of 10. Other: The formal drawings (sheets 3 and 5) are approved by the Examiner..